

University of Northern Iowa UNI ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate Documents

Faculty Senate

10-12-2009

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 12, 2009

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 2009 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 12, 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 855.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/855

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

10/12/09

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 9/28/09 meeting as corrected by Senator Smith; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson stated that she is aware that there is concern about the recent budget announcement by Governor Culver. The UNI Cabinet will be meeting first thing tomorrow morning to better understand what the Governor is asking for, clarification from the Board of Regents (BOR) on their recent press release, and to start planning on how we will deal with the approximately \$12 million cut; \$4 million from last year and \$8 million for this current year.

Provost Gibson noted this make UNI's Strategic Planning process even more important and crucial. There are two town hall meetings scheduled next week to begin the process, Wednesday, October 21, 10:00 - 12:00 and Thursday, October 22, 3:30 - 5:30. It is important that everyone be a part of the dialogue.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the 2009 - 2010 Faculty Roster has been published, and faculty have a couple of weeks to comment on it.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

989 2007 - 2008 Annual Report of the Liberal Arts Core

Motion to docket in regular order as item #895 by Senator Bruess; second Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

990 Review/Possible Revision of the Liberal Arts Core

Motion to docket in regular order as item #896 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Smith.

Senator Smith distributed the Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC) Charter Charge, developed in consultation with Provost Gibson, for consideration at the next Senate meeting, which will be sent to all UNI faculty with the agenda for the 10/26/09 meeting.

Motion passed with one abstention.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

894 "Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core" - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, was present to discuss this with the Faculty Senate. Dr. Morgan noted that in 2001 one of the strikes UNI had against it from the re-accreditation process was that we had no purposes and goals of the Liberal Arts Core (LAC). The LAC Committee (LACC) has worked at doing that on and off over the last few years. Last spring the LACC asked for input from the University community, which they received and they then revised the document and held discussions. One of the things that they would like faculty to note is that this is not done, and we should never be done; it should be a continually evolving document. It will probably change to as to what we think about the LAC in the future and we may add to some of these purposes and goals about what we want our students to accomplish in the LAC. This version is what we have now.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Senator East to approve the "Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core"; second by Senator Basom.

Senator Basom added a friendly amendment to add "creativity" under the "Skills" area before "creative problem-solving".

Senator Smith suggested "creativity, problem-solving", which Senator Basom agreed with.

Discussion followed.

Second to the motion to amend the motion by Neuhaus.

Motion to call the question by Senate Soneson.

Motion to change "creative" to "creativity," passed.

Senator Soneson moved to omit "Perspectives" from the third area and change it "Perspectives and Values", and change the first sentence to read "Students explore diverse cultural values and..." second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to insert "purpose" in the first sentence to read "The purpose of the Liberal Arts Core..." second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core with the three amended changes passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Soneson stated that he would like the Senate to discuss and perhaps make a decision about how the problem of financial cuts to our budget will be determined, in particular, he would like to move that the UNI President and Cabinet do their very best to not make across the board cuts, but to remember that the central purpose of UNI is academic, and that if serious cuts are to be made we urge them to be made especially in areas that are not academic in nature; second by Senator Bruess.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Senator Soneson stated that he wished to amend his motion, noting that this has been a very good discussion among colleagues and very helpful and appreciates all points of view.

Senator Soneson's amended motion is "Given the fact that this is first of all an academic institution, we urge the UNI President and the UNI Cabinet to keep this in mind as they determine where budget cuts will take place, so that cuts that are made at least sustain our academic excellence, and if possible, enhance our academic excellence."

He noted that this will leave room for a lot of concerns but that what we're most interested in is that we don't lose the academic excellence of our institution.

Senator Soneson's amended motion was agreed to by Senator Bruess who had made the second on the original motion.

Discussion followed.

Motion passed with one abstention.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Discussion continued on the budget.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 10/12/09 1668

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, Karen Breitbach, Michele Devlin, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Chuck Quirk, Michael Roth, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Tyler O'Brien was attending for Julie Lowell.

Absent: Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Phil Patton

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 9/28/09 meeting as corrected by Senator Smith; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson stated that she is aware that there is concern about the recent budget announcement by Governor Culver. The UNI Cabinet will be meeting first thing tomorrow morning to better understand what the Governor is asking for, clarification from the Board of Regents (BOR) on their recent press release, and to start planning on how we will deal with the approximately \$12 million cut; \$4 million from last year and \$8 million for this current year.

Provost Gibson noted this make UNI's Strategic Planning process even more important and crucial. There are two town hall meetings scheduled next week to begin the process, Wednesday, October 21, 10:00 - 12:00 and Thursday, October 22, 3:30 - 5:30. It is important that everyone be a part of the dialogue. They will also introduce the Strategic Planning Committee at that time. She asked that senators find time to attend one of the meetings. It will be taped and put on UNI's website for those that are unable to attend.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the 2009 - 2010 Faculty Roster has been published, and faculty have a couple of weeks to comment on it.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

989 2007 - 2008 Annual Report of the Liberal Arts Core

Motion to docket in regular order as item #895 by Senator Bruess; second Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

990 Review/Possible Revision of the Liberal Arts Core

Motion to docket in regular order as item #896 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Smith.

Senator Smith distributed the Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC) Charter Charge, developed in consultation with Provost Gibson, for consideration at the next Senate meeting, which will be sent to all UNI faculty with the agenda for the 10/26/09 meeting.

Motion passed with one abstention.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

894 "Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core" - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, was present to discuss this with the Faculty Senate. Dr. Morgan noted that in 2001 one of the strikes UNI had against it from the re-accreditation process was that we had no purposes and goals of the Liberal Arts Core (LAC). The LAC Committee (LACC) has worked at doing that on and off over the last few years. Last spring the LACC asked for input from the University community, which they received and they then revised the document and held discussions. One of the things that they would like faculty to note is that this is not done, and we should never be done; it should be a continually evolving document. It will probably change to as to what we think about the LAC in the future and we may add to some of these purposes and goals about what we want our students to accomplish in the LAC. This version is what we have now.

Dr. Morgan noted that it is a rather short document, which is pretty common for these types of descriptions. Some people had asked us to add things that were very explicit in areas such as "skills", which the committee felt were encapsulated in some of the other descriptors. They didn't want to get too specific in terms of the content, and obviously that can change, and it would not be practical to list all the content. They had also received a suggestion to include ethics as an important aspect, which is always a very touchy point as we try to make ethical students but it's hard to assess that. This is what they've come up with and they are now giving it to the faculty to consider.

Senator Soneson asked why they chose to use "Perspectives" rather than "values" as one of the three interrelated areas, noting values is a sharper term. We not just interested in knowing that people have different ideas but are really committed to fundamentally different things from around the world and within our own society. One of the fundamental tasks of the LAC is to expose students to the wide range of values in order to understand the diversity of humanity. It seems that "perspectives" is a colorless word compared to "values."

Dr. Morgan responded that that might be why they selected it. In a way it is softer, and the committee went back and forth on this, what to call that third area. Are we trying to instill values in our students?

Senator Soneson replied that no, we don't instill values; we look at, study and interpret and evaluate them.

Dr. Morgan noted that in aspects of perspectives, we're giving our students the more global perspective or whole world-view on things. In a way perhaps the best thing would be to say "perspectives and values" for that last paragraph. This was something that they were very up in the air about.

Senator Soneson commented that that would be a compromise, which would be all right. Perspectives has an intellectual note to it; values has a motivational aspect to it that perspectives just doesn't carry.

Senator Smith stated that he also shares some of the concern about "perspectives" and another term that is sometimes used is "dispositions", which can encompass values. On the issue of values, he doesn't think we should be ashamed of promoting or

trying to teach certain values, particularly intellectual values. Those are entirely appropriate for a university to teach and we shouldn't shy away from it. His general feeling about this is that it's a very bland document; you could take this and it could fit any university anywhere, which he suspects the committee intended. His perspective is that he hopes we could do better but if we are going to do better it would come out of the review process that we are hopefully going to be initiating with the LAC. He doesn't have quarrel with this but he hopes that two years from now we have a very different document because we have a very different LAC; a more distinctive document, a more distinctive Core so that we can justify to the people and students of Iowa that we are in fact the best public institute for undergraduate education in the state, and we need a better LAC to do that. This is very bland, basic and "white bread", which is fine for it's intent as a placeholder.

Dr. Morgan remarked that yes, it is to reflect the current LAC. If something erratically different is done in the future with the LAC then this certainly should be changed. This reflects the state of affairs we're in right now.

Senator Basom noted that she had two emails about making minor modifications to this. Ethics came up and under "Skills" several faculty members felt strongly that the word "creativity" should be listed as a skill rather than just "creative problem solving" because they are two different things, and we do try to teach students to be creative. Also, under "Knowledge" that there is a range, diversity and interconnectedness of knowledge. It's not just range and interconnectedness, it's also diversity, and that would add something to those two areas. Do we want to consider minor changes now or leave that to the next committee, because as Dr. Morgan said it should be a living document that changes.

Dr. Morgan responded that the LACC is a committee of the Faculty Senate, and they have provided the Senate with something they may or may not take as is, or can alter as they see fit. The Senate is entirely justified to alter things if they wish.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate will need a motion to take action on this. Editing can be done before a motion is made so that the motion is based on those changes, or a motion can be put on the table and then as part of the discussion the Senate can edit.

Motion by Senator East to approve the "Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core"; second by Senator Basom.

Senator Basom added a friendly amendment to add "creativity" under the "Skills" area before "creative problem-solving".

Senator Smith suggested "creativity, problem-solving", which Senator Basom agreed with.

Senator East noted that he doesn't understand "creativity" as a skill that we develop and would appreciate some type of explanation. He doesn't see creativity as a skill developed by universities.

Senator Smith commented that Senator Basom's point, which he feels is legitimate, is that in Art, and many other areas, it's not so much about problem solving but they are very often about encouraging creativity. It is different than creative problem solving.

Chair Wurtz noted that one of her favorite definitions of creativity is looking at the same thing everyone else is looking at but seeing something different.

Senator East remarked that he's not questioning the importance of creativity but he tends to have the opinion that art, music and writing teach performance; they develop people who can perform in those areas and their goal is to develop high levels of performance within their disciplines. It's always nice to say that we're encouraging or influencing creativity but it stills looks to him that what they're after is performance, much like the rest of us are after people performing well within our disciplines.

Senator East stated that he will not approve the friendly amendment.

Second to the motion to amend the motion by Neuhaus.

Motion to call the question by Senate Soneson.

Motion to change "creative" to "creativity," passed.

Senator Soneson moved to omit "Perspectives" from the third area and change it to "Perspectives and Values", and change the first sentence to read "Students explore diverse cultural values and..." second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to insert "purpose" in the first sentence to read "The purpose of the Liberal Arts Core..." second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core with the three amended changes passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Soneson stated that he would like the Senate to discuss and perhaps make a decision about how the problem of financial cuts to our budget will be determined, in particular, he would like to move that the UNI President and Cabinet do their very best to not make across the board cuts, but to remember that the central purpose of UNI is academic, and that if serious cuts are to be made we urge them to be made especially in areas that are not academic in nature; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator Soneson noted that, of course, there will be academic cuts but as faculty we want to urge that the Cabinet in particular remember that this first of all is an academic institution. Decisions are very likely going to be made within the next two weeks, serious decisions. We're talking about \$12 million, a huge hunk of UNI's budget. Everybody's going to suffer. In the past when major cuts have been made they've been across the board. If we have to take 73% of \$12 million on the academic side, we're going to be in very serious trouble. There are lots of other very important parts of the university that are not quite as important as academics. While we recognize that there will be cuts on the academic side we hope that those could be kept to a minimum. While the Senate can't demand we can urge the Cabinet to keep that in mind.

Senator Smith commented that he agrees that the cuts should not be across the board in the sense that everybody gives up 10%; that's a dumb way of making cuts. He is bothered by Senator Soneson's closing remark that says, gee, we're special and this is all about academics so we shouldn't be vulnerable to cuts the way other parts of this university are. He would argue that the main thrust of the cuts should be at the areas of this university that are least value adding, that are inefficient, where we have wasted resources. Many of those, he would argue, are on the academic side of this institution. He's bothered a lot by this "we're special, we deserve special favors" and the Faculty Senate looking like it's kind of setting itself up so

the faculty don't bear the brunt of cuts, when in fact in many ways the academic side of this institution needs to face up to some realities and in his view there are important cuts that should be made on the academic side. He's not sure they could easily take substantial chunks of money from other parts of this university, as they taken cuts in the past as well. The front part of the proposal he's fine with, that is not an across the board issue. The cuts should be selective and focus on the weaker, less important parts of what goes on here. But some of those parts are in the academic side of this university. He's not in agreement of the proposal that emphasizes a kind of exemption for academics.

Provost Gibson stated that she has two points; the first is that President Allen has made it clear that everything's on the table. Academics will be on the table and so will all other areas. There has been no discussion about whether the cuts will be across the board or not. She is not in favor of across the board cuts.

Secondly, Provost Gibson noted that at one emergency meeting held last week they agreed to discuss what they term "big ticket items", including perhaps academic programs that have not been successful over a long period of time.

Faculty Chair Swan asked what in the Academic Affairs budget is not academic? He believes that there are many things in that budget that might not be considered academic to many people. We could ask the Provost to consider those areas in the Academic Affairs budget to be cut first. How do we go about helping the Provost and her office understand what we value or what our perspective is on what is academic and what is not, yet we have it, for whatever reason, in academic-like programs? Is what Senator Soneson's talking about non-programs? The motion sounds good but what do we mean when we're asking the President and the Cabinet to consider academics first and to hold them relative free from cuts? What is that "academic" program?

Senator Soneson responded that he's thinking in particular of courses that faculty deliver, major programs, the LAC, majors that have had a history of success, these are all very important to the academic side of this university. We are here to help students develop skills, knowledge and values, to become educated. Whatever it is that is directly relevant to education he feels should be spared as much as possible. Other things are not quite as relevant to student education and his proposal is to look at those areas first and more seriously.

Provost Gibson noted that she supports the LAC, that it is very important to our students. However, she does believe that we need to look very carefully the LAC and the number of courses that are required and who is presently teaching those courses. She has a real concern about some of the areas and how we're going to continue to pay for those courses. Being perfectly honest, she doesn't know how we can continue to afford to, in some instances, pay adjuncts to teach numerous sections of some of the LAC courses. She has mentioned to several people serving on the LAC-RSC that we need to seriously look at the Core and see if there might be ways that it can be cut.

Faculty Chair Swan commented that prestigious Liberal Arts colleges don't have vocational and professional programs because they don't consider them to be academic. Do we, in this motion, consider them to be academic?

Senator Soneson replied that he believes that those programs are part of a comprehensive university, including professional programs, and would be considered a part of the academic side of this university.

Senator Roth offered a suggestion of what could be done, in certain cases, especially the LAC; with courses that have similar content is to combine courses. For example, he's taught the "Physics in Everyday Life" course, and that could be meshed with the chemistry course. The same content that students get in two courses could be offered in one course. This could also foster more interdepartmental activity.

Provost Gibson responded that those are the kinds of things administration will need to look at. That kind of creativity is what they're hoping to look at in the very near future.

Senator Devlin asked Provost Gibson if she has any idea how similar the decisions will need to be among the state universities; will all the universities do either across the board cuts or targeted cuts, or will each university do what they feel they need to do?

Provost Gibson replied that already Regent Miles has made two pronouncements; one being that there was a freeze on hiring. She believes that all three university presidents will say we cannot have a total freeze on hiring. There are key, crucial positions, both academic and support staff, such as those that keep the heat running and the lights on, that need have to be

filled. Many of those types of positions are due to the recent early retirement incentive program. We have to be able to hire replacements for some of those positions. In some instances, all three presidents will join forces on some issues, but there may be others that are specific to a particular campus.

Provost Gibson asked the senators for specific ideas that they feel would be helpful in addressing the budget concerns.

Senator VanWormer- suggested cutting the football team. On a recent "60 Minutes" show there was a segment on football, highlighting the potential for terrible injuries. She doesn't see that as academic.

Senator Smith agreed, noting that intercollegiate athletics in general at an institution like this is just too costly to maintain. We should encourage more intramural athletics because we really can't support the intercollegiate programs.

On the academic side, Senator Smith continued, in talking about the LAC, it is his guess that LAC courses are generally run in full, relatively large section sizes. From the standpoint of student credit hours per course, they are relatively efficient. Where the inefficiencies lay on the academic side are those courses with low enrollment programs that are forced to offer very low enrollment courses. In talking about what's valuable in the institution, they might look valuable from an academic standpoint but if students don't want to enroll in these programs or courses then at some point we have to say no, we can't afford to do that. We have to put those resources in the programs and courses that students do want to enroll in. He personally would endorse looking very strongly at low enrollment courses and programs, some of which are preserved because they are so good and of such a high quality that we bite the bullet and say we have to do this. But many others we don't.

Senator Funderburk added that there are staffing and administrative things to look at as well. Since he's been here at UNI we now have fewer faculty, twice the staff and more assistant administrators than at an earlier time.

Senator Breitbach stated that the last time we were in that huge economic downswing that we find ourselves in now, the ROB looked at programs at the three institutions, places where there was low enrollment and repetition in program offerings. As hard as it is to give up a program, we need to look at that again. We need to look at where there's repetition between UNI and our

other two sister institutions to see where we might consolidate, what institution has the better chance of offering the stronger program.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that along with that, if the BOR could be encouraged to look at other mechanisms of efficiency to provide services to all three state universities simultaneously, not having to produce the same services on the three campuses. An obvious area is library services. States have better shared environments including electronic resources. There are many areas that this could be done. We've tried that with the mail service.

Senator Neuhaus stated that Faculty Chair Swan is correct, there has been quite a bit of effort to get resources pooled that way. We're also dealing with private enterprises that don't necessarily want you to pool things together and there are also various academic groups involved. We can talk about the three sister institutions but those sisters have gravitational attractions of their own, called the Big Ten or whatever, and that's hard to deal with. There are political affiliations that are hard to overcome in some cases. We have been trying as much as we can and haven't been too successful because some of these forces have overwhelmed us. It's a noble thing to try for but you do have to keep in mind there are other forces.

Senator Devlin followed up on what Senator's Neuhaus and Breitbach both said, saying that it is worth looking at the duplication of programs and services. Universities draw on different kinds of students and students that are pulled in to one university are not necessarily qualified or able to get into others. There are some degrees or programs that are considered critical to state and national shortages, such as health care where by if we wipe out certain things we'd actually be contributing to that shortage. And then there are some units that are considered revenue generating because they are able to almost pay for themselves and actually make additional funds for the university.

Chair Wurtz added that if we think in terms of what we as faculty are being paid tax, tuition dollars, to do, faculty are in the position to pay taxes, and thus, we hand money over as taxes to get it back as salary. What are faculty paid to be doing? Most faculty teach two classes with two preps, and no more than three preps in a given year, plus all the service stuff faculty do, faculty may need to be ready to re-define what the job of a faculty person is. Particularly as she looks at

the service load, and still trying to get our committee situation to the point where it can just be looked at, all of us are extremely busy. Are we doing the things that really need to be done? She doesn't believe we have a good answer for that.

Senator Smith commented that Chair Wurtz has brought him out on an issue that he has felt about for a long time, in higher education. The budget pressures are constant from here on out, and higher education institutions have to look at faculty performance and productivity. In higher education there's a kind of prevailing assumption that research is always good and important and that we always should be doing it. If you look closely at it you'll find there's an awful lot of research done that isn't all that good or important. We ought to narrow ourselves down to make sure that the research that we do that takes up so much of our time is worth doing. Many people who don't really have much to do in terms of valuable research contributions should be encouraged to do more teaching, or more service. There should be a more flexible model for faculty performance and productivity, which would expand the teaching capacity in some cases, which would be a good thing to do.

Senator Basom added that she concurs completely with Senator Smith and believes we need to change how we do some things, which means we get away from how we report things. Until we change the structures or how we're measured, we're often tied into certain boxes. This is a long-term discussion and she hopes we don't make short changes and cuts that we're going to regret. When you're asked to do something very quickly, what's easy and convenient is often what's cut.

Senator Basom continued, asking that layoffs not be considered in any area, not just academic but across the campus, and that reassignments and efficiencies be considered instead. She speaks as a taxpayer because as a taxpayer the fewer people paying taxes the fewer taxes we'll have as a state and will begin a vicious cycle. This concerns her because the state has talked about state layoffs, with fewer people paying taxes. We need to look at efficiencies and revenue enhancements. Layoffs, including the athletic department, should not be considered unless absolutely essential because it does relate to the revenue side. She'd like to see this cycle stopped rather than continued.

Provost Gibson noted that if there are no layoffs than everyone would have to make other concessions. Honestly, she believes that there will probably be some layoffs. However, if we say no

layoffs, the money has to come from some place. What concessions would we all be willing to make, talking abstractly, theoretically, so that could happen?

Senator Basom responded that she had a faculty member say to her that he'd give up ten percent of what the university puts into his retirement account because we won't see that money anyway, and then put that money back into the university. Because we have a union, this would have to be approved by the union. People have these ideas that they're willing to consider, and many would probably vote to ratify such decisions if it would mean there wouldn't be layoffs. It does require talking with the unions.

Senator Devlin noted that getting back to what is our role as a university and a faculty with in it may be worth looking at. Some people are better suited to teaching four-class load, others better suited to doing other things. That might be a way to redistribute some of these roles, obligations and duties within the university without us becoming a large community college.

Senator Soneson stated that while no one wants to say it, one of the options that could come from Senator Basom's suggestion would be that every body at the university take a pay cut. If we're really serious about not laying people off, and the money's got to come from somewhere, he can't think of another place. What would be nice is that we at least have a choice, a say in the matter and it's not forced on us.

Provost Gibson commented that another idea that has been floated around is health care. UNI has an excellent plan; she was shocked when she came here and saw what UNI offers. This is something else that can be looked at.

Senator Roth remarked that he really loves UNI but the parking infrastructure, even with the new parking garage, leaves something to be desired. Are there any monies that can be diverted from parking, from parking tickets and parking permits, to help offset student tuition increases? Could any of that be reorganized?

Provost Gibson replied that she doesn't know, as she's not that knowledgeable on where that money ends up. However, we wouldn't be talking about a huge amount of money.

Senator Devlin asked Provost Gibson if they would not just be looking at cuts to make up the deficit but also at increases in tuition?

Provost Gibson responded that there has already been discussion on a tuition increase.

Northern Iowa Student Government Vice Chair Jake Rudy stated that the students said anything beyond a 3.5 increase would be very difficult for students to understand and pay.

Provost Gibson also noted that there would also be an increase in student fees, including the technology fees. They've already talked about tuition and student fee increases.

Senator Neuhaus commented that the other problem is that if tuition is raised high enough then we start losing students, which puts us on a whole different cycle. Any one solution is not without its consequences.

Faculty Chair Swan asked if we could look at going to the legislature and other places to change the foundation rules and how we raise and allocate money. At some very prestigious colleges and universities they are able to raise money to pay tuition for every student admitted, and there are mechanisms that appear to make that very difficult for us to do. We keep raising quite a lot of money for certain areas that some people on campus don't think we need to raise as much money for. Donors can be shaped and if we had more leadership in that area we could shape them into making donations to other areas. Though there are certain legal rules and arrangements that would have to be changed but that's another thing to look at.

Provost Gibson noted that if someone wants to give \$2 million to athletics it's going to be hard to change their mind, as that's where they want to give their money. Secondly, raising money for academics needs to be a higher priority. She has not seen a strategic plan for academics so that if a UNI Foundation representative is talking to a donor, that person can give the donor academic options for giving. That's something she needs to look into that, and if there's no such program then she needs to take leadership on developing that.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas commented on the issue of looking at additional resources through the reduction of wages versus the reduction of health care. She could more easily plan for a 10% reduction in her wages than for not having medical coverage for

her family or herself. Gambling with her health coverage is a significant issue that she would be less willing to entertain than if given a set wage reduction.

Provost Gibson asked about retirement contributions, out of the three wages, health care and retirement.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas replied that she looks at it as "magic Monopoly money", something that she never really gets to touch it and maybe she'll get to use. It's fun to play with it but the usability is not really there. Personally the last of the three that she would like to see effected would be health care coverage because it is so uncertain for any of us, and it is something that we've all appreciated at one time or another. Retirement would be the first that she would offer up because it also is so uncertain, will there be anything there when she's ready to retire?

Senator Funderburk noted that he hates to say this because he would be in agreement with Senator Smith but he hopes with all these cuts that the idea is to make this a leaner and meaner university. He would hate to see all these changes take place and leave us with an under funded, sloppy university in the end. If we have to make some hard cuts, lets make the ones that should probably have been done ten years ago and get things down to a more concentrated university that we can market.

Senator Soneson stated that he wished to amend his motion, noting that this has been a very good discussion among colleagues and very helpful, and appreciates all points of view.

Senator Soneson's amended motion is "Given the fact that this is first of all an academic institution, we urge the UNI President and the UNI Cabinet to keep this in mind as they determine where budget cuts will take place, so that cuts that are made at least sustain our academic excellence, and if possible, enhance our academic excellence."

He noted that this will leave room for a lot of concerns but that what we're most interested in is that we don't lose the academic excellence of our institution.

Senator Soneson's amended motion as agreed to by Senator Bruess who had made the second on the original motion.

Senator Roth stated that he likes the amended motion. It is so obvious that academics are important. If this goes to the president will he feel like we're telling him a no brainer?

Discussion followed.

Motion passed with one abstention.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator East asked Provost Gibson if the things that we discussed about being cut, those will establish a new baseline?

Provost Gibson replied that any cuts would be permanent. The Governor has already said that if state revenues begin to increase those revenues will go towards healthcare and public safety. She noted that it is very, very difficult for her. We're talking about people's lives, their income, their futures and she doesn't take any decision that she will have to make lightly because it is very serious. In talking with colleagues, she would appreciate if senators communicate that she does care, and that she will seriously take these cuts under consideration because these are people's lives.

Senator Soneson suggested that instead of permanent cuts that furloughs be offered, which could be dropped down the road when times get better.

Provost Gibson responded that, yes, she believes furloughs will be on the table as well. The Cabinet meeting is tomorrow morning at 7:00 A.M. and she will need suggestions before that.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator Devlin.
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden

Faculty Senate Secretary

TO: Susan Wurtz, Chair of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Siobahn Morgan, LACC Coordinator

DATE: September 11, 2009

RE: Request for the Faculty Senate to approve the "Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core" statement (attached).

The Liberal Arts Core Committee is asking that the Faculty Senate approve the statement defining the "Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core".

Background:

In 2001, the accreditation visit by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (now HLC) noted the "lack of recognition and acceptance of the value of general education courses among some students and faculty of the University." In the interim several changes have been made to the management of the LAC to help rectify this situation, including the appointment of the LAC Coordinator, the call by the Faculty Senate for Category Coordinating Committees, implementation of MAPP assessment of freshmen and seniors, and refining the goals and purposes of individual categories within the LAC through periodic category reviews. These category purpose statements are currently available on the LAC website (<http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/lac/purposecategory.shtml>).

Another item that has been lacking is a clear, concise statement concerning the purposes and goals of the entire LAC. Such a statement, as suggested in the attached document, is intended to be a *living* document, to be altered as the LAC is altered to reflect the changing views that arise concerning our best interests for our students. The LAC Committee will be required to keep the statement updated, and will review it periodically.

An earlier version of the attached document was made available to the University community in February 2009. Feedback on it was obtained via e-mail, written correspondence and via a weblog. These comments resulted in revisions to the original draft, and the enclosed document was approved by the LAC Committee on September 11, 2009.

The purpose for such a statement would be to clearly convey to all UNI students, parents, faculty and staff a message concerning the intention of the LAC program, and what the UNI faculty hopes that students attain through participation in the program. The "Purposes and Goals" statement should be part of basic information about the LAC provided through various means such as handouts/discussions during summer orientation of new students and new faculty hires, posted on the LAC website, included in course syllabi, included in the UNI Catalog, and included within other UNI curricular materials.

DRAFT

Purposes and Goals of the Liberal Arts Core

The purpose of the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) is to actively engage students to become self-aware participants in their own personal development through thoughtful and informed decision-making, promotion of life-long learning, enlarging the scope of their world to global issues and diverse cultures, and increasing their strategies for solving complex problems they will encounter in the future.

The LAC seeks to attain its purpose through fostering growth in three interrelated areas—skills, knowledge and perspectives.

Skills

Students develop skills in verbal and visual literacy and communication, quantitative and logical reasoning, information and technological literacy, aesthetic discernment, critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving, and interpersonal and social relationships in diverse linguistic and cultural settings. Courses throughout the LAC enhance these skills, which provide the tools for intellectual growth, career achievement, and civic engagement.

Knowledge

Students acquire knowledge of diverse disciplines and realms of human achievement, their histories, methods, and conceptual frameworks. Thus LAC courses illuminate the range and interconnectedness of knowledge, and encourage multiple ways of viewing and exploring complex issues.

Perspectives and Values

Students explore diverse cultural values and intellectual perspectives with the skills and knowledge learned in their LAC courses. These perspectives guide students in their understanding and respect for different cultures and principles, their engagement in local, national and global communities, and their development of innovative approaches to challenges they will face in their personal, social, and professional lives.

Students
First

SIS Project

Jan Hanish, UNI Project Director
Marcos Veloz, Ciber Project Manager
Mike Holmes, UNI Project Manager

Students
First

Why SIS?

For close to ten years UNI has been considering how to replace its aging Student Information System.

Our current system went on line in 1982:

- The database management system that has been the foundation, is non-standards based and is no longer being marketed by the vendor (CINCOM).
- This system is outdated technically, making it difficult to communicate with other systems or applications.
- The current architecture and applications were designed in a different era of information systems and, consequently, are not as flexible and easily extendable as needed.

Students
First

Why SIS?

A new, integrated system will:

- Enable us to deliver improved services for students and faculty, including extensive self-service capabilities for many tasks that require staff intervention today.
- Provide significantly improved user access to information and reporting tools to improve administrator's ability to see and address tactical and strategic challenges and opportunities
- Serve as a foundation for increased integration with other systems and technology necessary to more easily develop enhancements and new services in the future.

Students
First

SIS Implementation

- Following 18 months of planning with input from across campus, UNI has acquired PeopleSoft Campus Solutions suite of software and has secured the services of Ciber, Inc. for assistance with implementation
- The SIS Project Team and Technical Team have been announced and have been actively engaged in training that will start the process of moving forward into the new system
- The Executive Steering Committee continues to meet weekly

Students
First

Project Phases

The methodology consists of five phases or prototypes:


- Prototype 1: Discovery
- Prototype 2: Configuration
- Prototype 3: Complex Customizations
- Prototype 4: Environmental Adaptations
- Prototype 5: Deployment

Students
First

Expectations/Scope of Project

Three groups of features are being identified:

- **Gaps** occur when current functionality is not present "out of the box" with PeopleSoft. These gaps will be analyzed and solutions identified to filling the gaps.
- **New functionality** will be gained from the base PeopleSoft installation that is not available in our current system.
- **Future enhancements** will be identified that provide functionality our current system does not provide and is not delivered in the base PeopleSoft implementation.




Students
Web 2.0

Project Time Line

Go Live Dates

- Admissions	July 2010
- CRM (for Student Recruiting)	July 2010
- Portal	July 2010
- Department of Residence (Housing)	Sept 2010
- Financial Aid	Jan 2011
- Student Records	April 2011
- Academic Advising	April 2011
- Student Financials	July 2011



Students
Web 2.0

Project Information

SIS Project office:
 University of Northern Iowa
 SIS Project
 1148 Campbell
 Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0475

E-mail: sis@uni.edu
 Phone: (319) 273-4717
 Fax: (319) 273-4718

Project updates can be found at www.uni.edu/sis

If you have questions or recommendations you would like the project team to discuss, please submit a comment on the project website or send an email to sis@uni.edu

Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC)

The Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee will create opportunities for campus-wide discussion and review of the current Liberal Arts Core with the goal of using faculty input to shape proposals for its revision, if such revision is deemed necessary. The LAC-RSC sees its role as:

1. providing ample opportunities for gathering information and listening to faculty input regarding the strengths and challenges of the current LAC
2. disseminating information about best practices in general education so that we can make informed and forward-looking decisions about the LAC and
3. developing proposals, based on faculty input and best practices, for revising the LAC.

At the end of this process, the LAC-RSC anticipates that UNI will have a Liberal Arts Core that reflects the best academic judgments of the faculty and serves the best educational interests of our students.

ASSUMPTIONS:

- The LAC is a central part of every UNI student's education; therefore the entire UNI faculty has a stake in its makeup and success.
- The LAC provides the distinctive foundation for high quality undergraduate education that is central to UNI's mission.
- The LAC should be based on clearly stated learning outcomes which are assessable.
- The committee anticipates that the process of reviewing and possibly revising the LAC will take approximately two years.

STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESSFUL REVIEW:

1. Develop a transparent process that encourages faculty input and discussion in evaluation of the current LAC.
 - a. The review process will be open and accessible to all faculty.
 - b. Meetings will be announced and open.
 - c. Minutes will be posted on the website.
 - d. Conduct university-wide surveys to gather information
2. Provide opportunities for faculty to learn about current thinking and best practices in general education.

Possible strategies include:

 - a. Bring prominent thinkers to campus to stimulate discussions of ideas about general education.
 - b. Create website with a library of materials about current trends in general education.
 - c. Host "brown bag" lunches and other informal opportunities for faculty discussion.
 - d. Host college meetings.
 - e. Host a day long workshop.
3. Use faculty input and discussion to propose possible revisions to the LAC.

INITIAL QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. How can we best create opportunities for rethinking the LAC?
2. What do students need to know, value and be able to do as a result of having completed the LAC?
3. What are the strengths of the current LAC?
4. What would make the LAC better?
5. Are all departments that could contribute to the LAC making contributions? Making effective contributions?
6. What are the best practices in general education?

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Virginia Arthur, Co-Chair, Assoc. Provost for Faculty Affairs
April Chatham-Carpenter, Foundations of Excellence, CHFA
Nadine Davidson, COE
Bob Dise, Humanities Coordinator, CSBS
Deidre Heistad, CHFA

Susan Hill, Co-Chair, CHFA
Syed Kirmani, CNS
Siobahn Morgan, LAC Coordinator, CNS
Phil Patton, Registrar
Jerry Smith, CBA
Katherine van Wormer, CSBS
Jake Rudy, NISG